

PERSONALITY TRAITS OF A GROUP OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING
IN THE COOPERATIVE FOOD SERVICE AT
KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

by

ANNA LUCILE HADDEN

B. S., Iowa State College
of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, 1932

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of General Home Economics

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1939

Spec
Coll
LD
2668
T4
1939
H31

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	2
PROCEDURE.....	6
FINDINGS.....	14
Personality Rating Scale for Students in the Cooperative Food Service.....	18
SUMMARY.....	20
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	21
LITERATURE CITED.....	22
APPENDIX.....	24

130781

INTRODUCTION

Present economic conditions indicate that cooperative food service will be needed in the future as it has been in the past to enable students with limited incomes to secure college training at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science. This service should be of value to the organization as well as to the students participating in it. Those students with suitable personality, intelligence, and scholastic ability should, presumably, contribute better service than those who are inferior in these characteristics.

The number in the group is limited because of lack of adequate facilities to care for larger numbers of members. Some method of selecting students who would be of value to the organization seems advisable. A greater mutual service could be rendered if it were possible to know at the time of selecting the group members which students were likely to succeed in college and to complete their college courses. Because of the limits of the problem, it was impossible to determine the value of group participation to the students.

The purpose of this study was to construct a personality rating scale for students in the cooperative food

service at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science which would provide a guide for the future selection of members of the group.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature in the field of personality and personality traits is so extensive and complex that no attempt has been made to review all of it. The literature cited is that found applicable to the specific study. No study has been reported on exactly this problem, so no comparable studies can be reviewed. However, the traits selected, the methods of evaluating them, and the general rating scale procedures were based on those found in literature. To avoid confusion only one writer is cited for each reference, although several usually concur in the opinion.

Personality has been defined in various ways. According to Thorpe (13) personality is the balance among many specific traits and tendencies to action. Walters said (14) that an individual's personality depends on his social development, especially as it affects others with whom he comes in contact. It includes physical, intellectual, and emotional qualities.

The personality traits selected for a specific study

depend on several factors. Thorpe (13) stated that in the preliminary selection, samples of a relatively large variety of particular responses should be considered. Walters (14) cited some traits chosen by a group of employers, the Carnegie Foundation, and the Copeland Experiment. These traits were considered important in the selection of employees. Allport (1) stated that selected traits should be as objective as possible for objective traits are more easily ranked and rated than subjective ones. They should also be fundamental and exclusive in scope. Strong (12) concurred in this opinion and added that the traits selected for study should be observable by the rater and based on the subject's performance.

Personality rating scales may be constructed in several ways. Bingham and Freyd (5) classified such rating scales as man-to-man, paired comparison, order of merit, per cent, grouping, scale of alternatives, multiple step, linear, descriptive, and graphic. The graphic rating scale is a combination of the linear type of scale and the descriptive type. Strong (12) stated that the graphic rating scale should be made up of traits and definitions in the form of synonyms or behaviorgrams, and a line about five inches long with approximately five degrees of merit indicated by descriptive phrases under the line at appropriate points. These descriptive phrases under the line

should be objective and preferably in the form of behavior-grams. In the final construction of the scale, Bingham and Freyd (5) stated that the average degree of the trait should be in the center of the line and the extreme degrees of the trait at the ends of the line. The highest and lowest degrees of the trait should appear either alternately at the beginning and end of the line or haphazardly. In the latter plan, the highest degree may be at the beginning of the line for the first two traits, at the end of the line for the third trait, and at the beginning for the fourth trait. This plan is followed in any pattern the investigator chooses, through all the traits. No numerals should be included in the scale but they should be computed later by the investigator.

The judges or raters should be acquainted with the subjects according to Hollingsworth (10). The judges should record on the scale any doubt as to the reliability of their judgments. The judges should be trained and given specific directions as to the use of the scale. Allport (3) suggested a number of judges not fewer than three nor more than ten.

To do away with the "halo" effect due to biased judging, Strong (12) stated that the judges should rate one trait at a time through the entire group of subjects. They should be fair and unprejudiced in their ratings, and rate

throughout the entire range of the scale if the subjects merit such ratings. Allport (1) asserted that judging traits separately avoids the tendency to allow good or bad behavior in one trait to bias the opinion on other traits. Judgments should be based on actual behavior, not on impressions. Bingham and Freyd (5) suggested that judges be warned against rating those they know best the highest, and to remember that extremes are rare and the average is general.

Allport (2) avoided the "halo" effect by warning judges that they were apt to judge those to be best who are most like themselves, and by asking the judges to rate the subjects carefully and objectively.

Allport (3) stated that the means of the ratings of several judges should be used for all calculations. Bingham (4) reported that scores obtained on a rating scale should be transmitted into standard scores for use in calculations.

Walters (14) said that the mean ratings obtained on the scale should be correlated with a criterion score to test the scale's validity. The scale should also be tested for reliability. Strong (12) stated that the coefficients of validity are significant if the criterion used is an objective one. The graphic rating scale usually has a high reliability with a correlation coefficient of .76 to .87.

PROCEDURE

The steps that contribute to the construction of a personality rating scale are: the selection of traits, the determination of tentative weights to be attributed to these traits, the form of the scale, the directions to the judges, the determination of the reliability and validity of the separate traits, and the revision of the scale to a final form, including a reweighting of the trait values.

In this study, twenty personality traits were selected from published personality studies. These traits and their definitions were submitted to nine members of the staff of the Department of Institutional Management who served as judges. The judges were asked to check the ten traits they considered most important in measuring the personalities of the students in the cooperative food service at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science and to rank these traits in the order of their importance.

Proper weights were given to the ranked traits according to methods recommended by Guilford (9). The ten traits receiving the maximum weights were selected for use in making up the tentative personality rating scale. These traits were industriousness, cooperativeness, dependability, personal appearance, efficiency, honesty, judgment,

responsibility, social adaptability, and resourcefulness.

These ten traits with their definitions were resubmitted to the same group of judges for weighting. The judges were asked to divide 100 points among the ten traits. These weights indicated the comparative value of the traits in the opinion of the judges. The mean of these weightings determined the actual value of the traits in the tentative personality rating scale. No number values appeared on the scale. They were retained in the files of the investigator.

The rating scale was constructed using the selected ten traits and their definitions. The graphic type of scale was used with a line about five inches long having five degrees of the trait separately defined at appropriate points under the line. The definitions were in the form of synonyms or behaviorgrams and were as objective as possible. The average degree of the trait was placed at the center of each line and the extremes at the ends of the line. The highest degree of the first two traits appeared at the left end of the line, with the third trait at the right end of the line, and alternately at the left and right ends of the lines throughout the other seven traits. Directions for using the scale were given at the beginning of the scale.

One hundred students in the cooperative food service were rated using this scale. Five members of the staff of

the Department of Institutional Management served as judges. These judges were given oral instructions in the use of the scale as well as those included in the scale itself. They were asked to judge one trait at a time for all the subjects and to be fair and unbiased in their judgments. The various synonyms were explained by the investigator so that all the judges would have the same understanding of the trait. The written instructions included warnings as to care in reading the trait definitions and in the use of the scale, and asked that each judge rate only those students and traits that she knew well enough to judge with a fair degree of confidence.

Ratings on the 100 students were obtained using this personality rating scale. Of the 500 possible ratings, 397 ratings were made on all ten traits. At least two judges rated all the students except one. This student was rated by only one judge.

A rating scale for the relative value of the student to the organization was devised. The same group of five judges was asked to rate the same group of 100 students on this relative value scale. These ratings were used as criterion scores. Of the 500 possible ratings, 417 ratings were made by the judges on this scale.

The ratings obtained from both the personality rating

scale and the criterion score scale were scored. The mean weights given to the traits by the judges in the preliminary evaluation were used as values for the traits. These values were as follows:

Honesty	12	Responsibility	10
Dependability	12	Personal appearance	9
Cooperativeness	11	Social adaptability	9
Efficiency	11	Resourcefulness	8
Industriousness	10	Judgment	8

The criterion scores were evaluated on a basis of 1 to 10 points, with 1 as the lowest possible score and 10 as the highest.

The scores obtained with both rating scales were converted into values on a standard scale with a mean of 5.5 and a standard deviation of 1.0. The method of conversion was that used by Hull (11) in converting original scores to standard scores:

"Let M = mean of the original series.

Let σ = the standard deviation of the original series.

Let X = a given individual's score in the original series.

Also,

Let M' = the mean of the new series.

Let σ' = the standard deviation of the new series.

Let X' = the same individual's score in the new series.

This is the value to be found.

Then, $X' = K + SX$

where $S = \frac{\sigma}{\sigma'}$

and $K = M' - SM$."

To illustrate: for the trait industriousness, rated by Judge I on subject 1, the original score was 8.0. The mean of all the scores of Judge I on this trait was 7.5 and the σ was 1.8. To change the score 8.0 to a standard score with a mean of 5.5 and a σ' of 1.0, the computation was as follows:

Original Series

$$M = 7.5$$

$$\sigma = 1.8$$

$$X = 8.0$$

Standard Score Series

$$M' = 5.5$$

$$\sigma' = 1.0$$

$$X' = \text{to be found}$$

Also,

$$S = \frac{1.8}{1.0} = 1.8$$

$$K = 5.5 - 1.8 \times 7.5 = -8.0$$

Therefore,

$$X' = -8 + 1.8 \times 8 = 6.4$$

Like computation of X' was done for each of the trait scores and each of the criterion scores. When all scores had been converted into standard scores, they were ready to be used in the computation of means and standard deviations

and in the various correlations required in the study.

The intelligence scores were obtained from the Psychology Office at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science. It was found that there were 24 transfer students in the group for whom no freshman intelligence scores were available. Three of these students agreed to take a shorter version of the freshmen tests that has been found to adequately measure intelligence. These students were included in the study. The intelligence scores ranged from a percentile rank of 6 to a percentile rank of 99. Since intelligence scores were essential for the study, only these 79 subjects were used in further computations.

College grades were obtained from the files in the office of the college Registrar. The grades the subject earned in his first semester at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science were used for all subjects. Those grades were recorded on a form and evaluated according to methods used in the Psychology Office. In this method of evaluation, A = 5 points, B = 4 points, C = 3 points, D = 2 points, F = 1 point. The point value of the grade multiplied by the number of hours in the course, gave the total number of points secured in the particular course. The total number of points for all the courses divided by the number of hours studied for the semester gave a value

that could be used as the college grades in the computations necessary to the study.

Correlations between the criterion scores and the college grades and intelligence scores were made on the basis of the 79 subjects. The method used was that of Garret (8).

The correlation between criterion scores and college grades was $-.09$, with a probable error of $.07$. Such a correlation has no significance so no further correlations were made using college grades.

The correlation between criterion scores and intelligence scores was $.32$, with a probable error of $.06$. Such a correlation has enough significance to warrant using the data for further computation. Correlations were made between each trait and the criterion scores. These correlations determined the coefficients of validity. Reliability coefficients were determined by correlating the ratings made by Judges IV and V for each trait. These coefficients were stepped up to equivalent coefficients for five judges by the method of the Spearman-Brown Formula as presented by Edgerton and Toops (7). Correlations were calculated between the scores on each trait and the intelligence scores. Partial and multiple correlations were calculated using the trait scores, criterion scores, and intelligence scores.

Coefficients of regression were calculated using the mean ratings of the four traits that showed the highest predictive value in the partial and multiple correlations, and the criterion scores. These traits were industriousness, cooperativeness, dependability, and responsibility. These coefficients were determined according to the method of Cooke (6). The trait, honesty, had shown a higher coefficient of reliability than some other traits, but was omitted from the regression equation because the criterion of determining the traits to be included in the construction of the final scale was the predictive value shown in the partial and multiple correlations. Honesty had shown a very low predictive value in these correlations.

The final personality rating scale was constructed using the four traits for which coefficients of regression had been calculated. The values of the traits in this scale were those determined by the weightings of these coefficients.

FINDINGS

A total of 397 ratings were obtained for all ten traits. One student was rated by only one judge. A total of 417 ratings were obtained on the relative value or criterion scale.

The correlation between criterion scores and college grades was $-.09$ with a probable error of $.07$. The correlation between criterion scores and intelligence scores was $.32$ with a probable error of $.06$.

Table 1. The means and standard deviations of the trait scores in standard score form and of the intelligence scores and college grades.

Name of score	Mean	Probable error of the mean	Standard deviation
Industriousness	5.7	.18	2.34
Cooperativeness	5.8	.16	2.23
Dependability	5.7	.16	2.16
Efficiency	6.3	.13	1.78
Responsibility	5.5	.15	1.97
Social adaptability	5.4	.12	1.51
Resourcefulness	5.4	.12	1.51
Criterion	5.5	.16	2.20
Intelligence	56.3	2.16	28.90
College grades	3.3	.09	1.2

Table 2. Weighted and correlated values of the ten traits in the personality rating scale.

Trait	Weighted value assigned by judges	Correlation with criterion scores		Correlation with intelligence scores		Reliability	
		Value of r	P.E. _r	Value of r	P.E. _r	2 judges	5 judges
Industrious- ness	10	.70	.04	.15	.07	.38	.75
Cooperative- ness	11	.72	.04	.12	.07	.20	.56
Dependability	12	.77	.03	.40	.06	.30	.68
Responsi- bility	10	.70	.04	.20	.07	.19	.54
Efficiency	11	.68	.04	.23	.07	.25	.63
Honesty	12	.59	.05	.11	.07	.50	.83
Judgment	8	.49	.06	.12	.07	.24	.61
Social adaptability	9	.62	.05	.04	.08	.13	.43
Resourceful- ness	8	.61	.05	.16	.07	-.92	-.98
Personal appearance	9	.14	.07	.12	.07	.04	.17

The coefficient of correlation should be equal to at least four times its probable error to be sure of any real or significant correlation.

The five traits that showed the highest evaluation by the judges also correlated to the highest degree with the criterion and intelligence scores. These traits were industriousness, cooperativeness, dependability, responsibility, and efficiency.

Table 3. Coefficients of partial and multiple correlation using the traits that showed the highest validity, the criterion scores, and the intelligence scores.

Trait	Coefficients of partial correlation			Coefficient of multiple correlation ($R_1(32)$)
	$r_{12.3}$	$r_{13.2}$	$r_{23.1}^*$	
Cooperativeness	.78	-.17	.36	.72
Dependability	.74	.24	.02	.79
Industriousness	.77	-.10	.34	.70
Responsibility	.69	-.03	-.26	.70
Efficiency	.65	.09	.19	.67
Social adaptability	.64	-.21	.38	.63
Resourcefulness	.61	-.05	.29	.62

* 1 = trait, 2 = criterion scores, 3 = intelligence scores.

Personality Rating Scale for Students in the Cooperative Food Service

Rating of _____ Date _____ Personality Score _____ Rated by _____

Directions for using the scale:

1. Read carefully the definition of the trait and its separate degrees.
2. Check (✓) at the appropriate point to show the amount of the trait the student being rated possesses.
3. Do not rate a student on a trait which you do not feel you can judge with a fair degree of confidence.
4. Do not hesitate to rate the student at the lowest or highest level of a trait if you feel he belongs there. Few if any students are average in all traits. Excellent personalities may stand below the average in some traits. Poor personalities may be above average in some traits.
5. Five descriptions of the trait can not cover all phases, especially when two or more sub-traits are included. In such cases the rater should use her best judgment in checking the scale.

(Be as objective as you can in rating the student.)

Traits and Definition	Rating Scale					Check here if no chance to observe
<u>Industriousness</u> Ability to work energetically and steadily.	Works energetically and steadily. Often does extra work.	Usually works enthusiastically at job.	Accomplishes most of the assigned work in the allotted time. Inclined to be slow and uninterested.	Does little work without supervision and listlessly.	Very lazy. Needs much prodding to accomplish anything.	
<u>Cooperativeness</u>	Works gladly with others for the good of the group.	Usually works with others for the good.	Works fairly well with others. Sometimes works better alone.	Usually works poorly with others.	Works better alone. Does not get along with others.	
<u>Dependability</u>	Can always be trusted to follow instructions and do good work.	Usually can be trusted to follow instructions.	About half the time he follows instructions in doing work.	Usually bungles instructions and does part of the work poorly.	Almost never carries out instructions or does the job as he is expected to.	
<u>Responsibility</u>	Able and willing to take charge of an assigned duty.	Able but not always willing to take charge of an assigned duty.	Fairly able and moderately willing to take charge of an assigned duty.	Usually fairly able but unwilling to take charge of an assigned duty.	Unable and unwilling to do the duty.	

The coefficients of regression using the mean ratings of the four traits that showed the highest predictive value in the partial and multiple correlations and the criterion scores were:

Industriousness	.75
Cooperativeness	.90
Dependability	1.33
Responsibility	.43

The regression equation was:

$$\bar{X}_2 = .75X_1 + .90 X_3 + 1.33X_4 + .43X_5 + (-13.95)$$

The weighted values of the coefficients were:

Industriousness	.22
Cooperativeness	.26
Dependability	.39
Responsibility	.13

The personality score on the final rating scale would be made up of .22 parts of the trait, industriousness; .26 parts of the trait, cooperativeness; .39 parts of the trait, dependability; and .13 parts of the trait responsibility. The P.E. est_{X₂} = 1.09. The coefficient of multiple correlation was:

$$R_2(1345) = .54.$$

Directions for scoring the scale: Make a total personality score of 100 points or perfection by using the following values:

Industriousness =	22
Cooperativeness =	26
Dependability =	39
Responsibility =	13.

Each trait line is calibrated to fit the total score of the trait. Examples of scoring traits on the final scale:

1. Student A is rated at the highest value of the trait, industriousness. He scores 22.

2. He is rated average for cooperativeness. He scores $\frac{3}{5}$ of 26 or 15.6.

3. He is rated at the second step from the highest for dependability. He scores $\frac{4}{5}$ of 39 or 31.2.

4. He is rated at the highest value for responsibility and scores 13.

Total personality score = $22 + 15.6 + 31.2 + 13 + 81.8$.

The subjects included 9 seniors, 15 juniors, 32 sophomores, and 23 freshmen. As a group, the seniors ranked highest in personality and intelligence. The juniors and sophomores ranked second in personality, and the freshmen ranked lowest. The sophomores ranked second in intelligence scores, the juniors third, and the freshmen fourth, or lowest. In scholastic ability, the seniors and sophomores ranked first, the juniors second, and the freshmen third.

SUMMARY

1. A personality rating scale for students in the cooperative food service at Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science which would provide a guide for the selection of members of the group was constructed.

2. The means of the trait scores ranged from 5.4 to 6.3 with a standard deviation of 1.51 to 2.34. The mean of the intelligence scores was 56.3 with a standard deviation of 28.90. The mean of the college grades was 3.3 with a standard deviation of 1.20.

3. The five traits that were evaluated highest by the judges showed the highest correlation with the criterion and intelligence scores.

4. The four traits that showed the highest predictive value in the partial and multiple correlations were industriousness, cooperativeness, dependability, and responsibility.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. J. C. Peterson, Professor of Psychology, under whose guidance this investigation was planned and carried out. Grateful acknowledgments are also made to Mrs. Lucile Rust, Professor of General Home Economics; to Miss Jessie McDowell Machir, Registrar; to Miss Florence E. James, Assistant Professor of Institutional Management, and to the other members of her staff whose cooperation made this study possible.

LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Allport, Floyd H.
Social psychology. Boston. Houghton Mifflin.
453 p. 1924.
- (2) Allport, Gordon W.
Personality and character. Psychological
Bulletin, 18: 441-455. 1921.
- (3) Allport, Gordon W.
Personality. A psychological interpretation.
New York. Henry Holt. 588 p. 1938.
- (4) Bingham, Walter.
Aptitudes and aptitude testing. New York.
Harper and Brothers. 390 p. 1937.
- (5) Bingham, Walter and Freyd, Max.
Procedures in employment psychology. Chicago.
A. W. Shaw. 269 p. 1926.
- (6) Cooke, Dennis H.
Minimum essentials for statistics. New York.
Macmillan. 271 p. 1936.
- (7) Edgerton, Harold A. and Toops, Herbert A.
A table for predicting the validity and
reliability of a test when lengthened. Jour. of
Educ. Res. 18 (3): 225-234. 1928.
- (8) Garrett, Henry E.
Statistics in psychology and education, 2nd. ed.
New York. Longmans, Green. 493 p. 1937.
- (9) Guilford, J. P.
Psychometric methods. New York. McGraw-Hill.
566 p. 1936.
- (10) Hollingsworth, H. L.
Vocational psychology and character analysis.
New York. D. Appleton. 409 p. 1929.
- (11) Hull, Clark L.
Aptitude testing. New York. World Book.
535 p. 1928.

- (12) Strong, Edward K.
Psychological aspects of business. New York.
McGraw-Hill. 629 p. 1938.
- (13) Thorpe, Louis P.
Psychological foundations of personality. New
York. McGraw-Hill. 620 p. 1938.
- (14) Walters, J. E.
Individualizing education by means of applied
personnel procedures. New York. John Wiley
and Sons. 278 p. 1935.

APPENDIX

Honesty

Integrity, fairness, ability to be worthy of trust.

Can not be trusted. Must always be watched.	Usually can not be trusted. Needs frequent watching.	Tempted at times. Needs occasional watching.	Usually can be trusted.	Genuinely honest and completely worthy of trust.
---	--	--	-------------------------	--

Dependability

Reliability, trustworthiness especially in following instructions and doing work.

Can always be trusted to follow instructions and do good work.	Usually can be trusted to follow instructions.	About half the time he follows instructions in doing work.	Usually bungles instructions and does part of the work poorly.	Almost never carries out instructions or does the job as he is expected to.
--	--	--	--	---

Judgment

Discrimination, ability to make wise decisions.

Does not use his head. Jumps wildly at conclusions.	Usually makes poor decisions.	Makes acceptable decisions if given sufficient time.	Usually shows common sense and makes fair decisions in a reasonable length of time.	Makes good decisions quickly.
---	-------------------------------	--	---	-------------------------------

Efficiency

Ability to work systematically and effectively. Ability to accomplish work with a minimum of time and effort.

Does excellent work with a minimum of time and effort.	Usually does good work in a fair length of time and with little effort.	Does fair work. Takes longer and works harder to accomplish it.	Usually does poor work. Works quickly but wastes effort.	Does poor work. Wastes time and energy.
--	---	---	--	---

Personal Appearance

Sum total of looks and manner.

Slovenly and unattractive. Almost always discourteous and disagreeable.	Not too neat but fairly clean. Often discourteous and unpleasant.	Fairly clean and neat. Sometimes discourteous and disagreeable.	Usually fairly clean and neat. Almost always courteous and pleasant.	Is clean, well-groomed, courteous, and attractive.
---	---	---	--	--

Responsibility

Ability and willingness to take charge of assigned duty.

Able and willing to take charge of assigned duty.	Able but not always willing to take charge of assigned duty.	Fairly able and moderately willing to take charge of assigned duty.	Usually fairly able but unwilling to take charge of assigned duty.	Unable and unwilling to do the duty.
---	--	---	--	--------------------------------------

Social Adaptability

Ability to fit in with the group.

A misfit. Avoided by the other members of the group.	Usually a misfit. Tolerated by others in the group.	Fits in fairly well with the group. Liked by his own particular friends.	Usually fits in well with the group. Quite well liked by others.	Fits in well with the group. Often attracts others.
--	---	--	--	---

Resourcefulness

Ability to meet a situation ably.

Well able to handle a situation with knowledge and skill.	Usually handles a situation with knowledge and a fair amount of skill.	Handles a situation with fair knowledge and some skill.	Handles a situation poorly through lack of knowledge or skill.	Usually shows complete lack of knowledge and skill in handling a situation.
---	--	---	--	---

Rating Scale for the Relative Value of the Student to the Organization

Rating of _____ Date _____ Score _____ Rated by _____

Directions for using the scale:

1. Read carefully the descriptions on the scale.
2. Check (/) the line at the appropriate place to show the Relative Value of the Student to the Organization.
3. Do not rate a student whom you feel you do not know enough about to rate with a fair degree of confidence.
4. Do not hesitate to rate the student at the lowest or highest level of the scale if you feel he belongs there.

Be as objective as you can in rating the student on this value.

Check here if no chance to observe

Trait

Rating Scale

Relative value of the student to the organization.

